

# U.S. SunShot Program and Grid Integration Overview

Mark S. Mehos, Program Manager, CSP NREL

## Discussion

- U.S. SunShot Overview
- Understanding the Value of CSP with Thermal Energy Storage

#### U.S. DOE SunShot Initiative – Concentrating Solar Power

- SunShot initiated in 2012
- Identified technology and cost objectives to achieve <u>6¢ LCOE</u> target:
  - solar field
  - receiver
  - thermal storage/HTF
  - power block



#### **CSP Program Technical Targets**



#### U.S. DOE SunShot Initiative – Concentrating Solar Power

Cents per Kilowatt Hour

On the Path to SunShot (2016)

- Update of original CSP SunShot Vision Study
- Significant CSP cost reductions realized since 2012
- Cost reductions driven primarily by solar field cost reductions and learning



#### CSP Gen3 Roadmap

- Identifies multiple pathways to achieve remaining performance gains and cost reductions
- Leverages DOE R&D support for high-temperature supercritical carbon dioxide (sCO<sub>2</sub>) Brayton cycle





#### Concentrating Solar Power Gen3 Demonstration Roadmap

Mark Mehos, Craig Turchi, Judith Vidal, Michael Wagner, and Zhiwen Ma National Renewable Energy Laboratory Golden, Colorado

Clifford Ho, William Kolb, and Charles Andraka Sandia National Laboratories Albuquerque, New Mexico

Alan Kruizenga Sandia National Laboratories Livermore, California

NREL is a national laboratory of the U.S. Department of Energy Office of Energy Efficiency & Renewable Energy Operated by the Alliance for Sustainable Energy, LLC

This report is available at no cost from the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) at www.nrel.gov/publications.

Technical Report NREL/TP-5500-67464 January 2017

Contract No. DE-AC36-08GO28308

#### Third Generation CSP: 700 °C+

#### sCO<sub>2</sub> Power Cycles

- Can achieve η > 50%
   operating at >700°C
- Scale from 50-500 MW and can scale to 10 MW with modest η decrease
- Suitable for dry cooling



#### Third Generation CSP: 700 °C+ Leveraging Cross-Cutting STEP Initiative



efficiency> 50%

	Collector Field		
	• Cost <\$75/m <sup>2</sup> • Concentration ratio >50	io • Operable in 35-mph winds	• Optical error <3.0 mrad
	Molten Salt	Falling Particle	Gas Phase
<b>Receiver</b> Cost< \$150/kWth Thermal Efficiency> 90% Exit Temperature> 720°C 10,000 cycle lifetime	<ul><li>Similarities to prior demonstrations</li><li>Allowance for corrosive attack required</li></ul>	<ul> <li>Most challenging to achieve high thermal efficiency</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>High-pressure fatigue challenges</li> <li>Absorptivity control and thermal loss management</li> </ul>
Material & Support Cost< \$1/kg Operable range from 250°C to 800°C	<ul> <li>Potentially chloride or carbonate salt blends; ideal material not determined</li> <li>Corrosion concerns dominate</li> </ul>	Suitable materials readily exist	<ul> <li>Minimize pressure drop</li> <li>Corrosion risk retirement</li> </ul>
<b>Thermal Storage</b> Cost < \$75/kWrh 99% energetic efficiency 95% exergetic efficiency	Direct or indirect storage may be superior	<ul> <li>Particles likely double as efficient sensible thermal storage</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Indirect storage required</li> <li>Cost includes fluid to storage thermal exchange</li> </ul>
HTF to sC02 Heat Exchanger	<ul> <li>Challenging to simultaneously handle corrosive attack and high-pressure working fluid</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Possibly greatest challenge</li> <li>Cost and efficiency concerns dominate</li> </ul>	Not applicable

sink at 40° C

ambient

temperature 700°C

cost< \$900/kWe

- Molten Salt
- Particle
- Gas-Phase



- Molten salt technology represents most familiar pathway toward Gen3 targets, e.g. receiver and TES design.
- Intermediate temperature salts (<650C) may provide opportunity for near-term deployment.
- Development of high-temperature salts and compatible containment materials represent highest priority R&D challenges.

- Molten Salt
- Particle
- Gas-Phase



- Particle-based systems can avoid degradation and corrosion challenges associated with advanced high-temperature molten salt systems.
- Many BOS components, e.g. particle HXs, storage, and conveyance, have been developed by industry for alternative applications.
- Primary challenges include efficient heating of particles through direct or indirect solar illumination , flow control, and containment.

- Molten Salt
- Particle
- Gas-Phase



- Primary advantages include gas-phase stability over broad temperature range of operation, low HTF corrosivity, and simplicity of gaseous HTF-to-sCO2 heat exchangers.
- Several gas-phase receiver designs indicate thermal efficiencies >90% are achievable.
- Challenges include inferior heat transfer characteristics and relative immaturity of compatible TES and integration approaches relative to other pathways.

## Discussion

- U.S. SunShot Overview
- Understanding the Value of CSP with Thermal Energy
   Storage

## **Beyond Levelized Cost of Energy**

- Competition with PV is often viewed based on LCOE (or power purchase price)
- The dispatchability of CSP with TES provides value not captured by a simple LCOE calculation
- There is a need to educate utilities, regulators, and researcher organizations on proper methods for evaluating and maximizing the benefits of CSP

#### CAISO Duck Curve – Circa 2013



#### Quantifying the Benefits of CSP with Thermal Energy Storage

- Colorado "Test" System
- California/WECC

http://www.nrel.gov/publications

Estimating the Value of Utility-Scale Solar Technologies in California Under a 40% **Renewable Portfolio Standard** J. Jorgenson, P. Denholm, and M. Mehos NREL is a national laboratory of the U.S. Department of Energy Office of Energy Efficiency & Renewable Energy Operated by the Alliance for Sustainable Energy, LLC This report is available at no cost from the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) at www.nrel.gov/publications **Technical Report** NREL/TP-6A20-61685 May 2014 Contract No. DE-AC36-08GO28308

#### Analysis of Operational and Capacity Benefits of CSP in Southwest Balancing Area



## **June Price and Dispatch**



## **January Price and Dispatch**



#### California ISO Analysis – 33% Renewable Portfolio Standard

Relative to PV, CSP provides additional operational Value to California grid

	Marginal Operational Value (\$/MWh)		
	CSP-TES	PV	
	(SM = 1.3, 6 hrs TES)		
Displaced Fuel	40.2	27.8	
Displaced Emissions	10.3	3.1	
Reduced Startup &	1.6	-0.6	
Shutdown			
Reduced Variable	0.4	1.2	
O&M			
Total	52.7	31.6	

#### **CAISO Analysis – Operational Value**



Lowest solar multiples (lower annual capacity factors) yield the highest operational system value

#### **CAISO Analysis – Capacity Value**

CSP integrated with thermal energy storage maintains high capacity value

	Capacity Credit (%)	
	CSP-TES (with > 3 Hrs Storage)	PV
33% RPS Scenario	92.2%	22%
40% RPS Scenario	96.6%	3.4%

#### **CAISO** Analysis – Total Valuation

 Relative value of CSP is \$48/MWh greater than PV in the 33% scenario and about \$63/MWh greater in the 40% scenario



## **Summary**

- CSP costs have fallen dramatically, driven primarily by learning and solar field cost reductions.
- Additional cost reductions are foreseen, driven by additional learning and integration with advanced thermodynamic cycles.
- LCOE is an incomplete metric when considering the value of dispatchable CSP.
- Operational flexibility and dispatchability add considerable value to CSP generation.
- Under conditions of high-penetrations of variable generation technologies, the value of CSP can be 5-6 cents/kwh higher than PV.
- Net system benefit, not discussed today, is recommended for sideby-side comparisons of CSP with other generation technologies.



## Thank you!

#### **Questions?**

#### Synergistic Benefits of PV and CSP with Thermal Energy Storage

Investigated the impact of CSP w/ thermal energy storage as an enabling technology for high penetrations of solar (PV and CSP).



Enabling Greater Penetration of Solar Power via the Use of CSP with Thermal Energy Storage

Paul Denholm and Mark Mehos

INFEL is a national laboratory of the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Energy Efficiency & Renewable Energy, operated by the Alliance for Sustainable Energy, U.C.

Technical Report NREL/TP-6A20-52978 November 2011

Contract No. DE-AC96-08GO28308

## Average and marginal curtailment rates of PV in base scenario







#### **Common FE, NE, EERE Application Space**

Application	Size [MWe]	Temperature [°C]	Pressure [MPa]
Nuclear (NE)	10 – 300	350 – 700	20 – 35
Fossil Fuel (FE) (Indirect heating)	300 – 600	550 – 900	15 – 35
Fossil Fuel (FE) (Direct heating)	300 – 600	1100 – 1500	35
Concentrating Solar Power (EERE)	10 – 100	500 – 1000	35
Shipboard Propulsion	<10 – 10	200 – 300	15 – 25
Waste Heat Recovery (FE)	1 – 10	< 230 – 650	15 – 35
Geothermal (EERE)	1 – 50	100 – 300	15

#### DOE sCO2 Crosscut Initiative: R&D



**Crosscut Tech Team** 

Pillar	Objective	Participant
R&D	<ul> <li>Accelerate technology development</li> <li>Improve performance and cost</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Universities</li> <li>National Labs</li> <li>Industry</li> <li>International collaboration</li> </ul>
STEP (Super- critical CO <sub>2</sub> Technology Electric Power) 10 MWe demo	<ul> <li>Test system performance under steady and transient conditions</li> <li>Validate component performance</li> <li>Reconfigure for applications, test next- generation components, optimize performance</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>STEP facility team</li> <li>Component OEM</li> <li>Other collaboration</li> </ul>
Demo	<ul> <li>Demonstrate commercial viability</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Industry</li> </ul>